

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

The office action of April 1, 2003 has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested.

Claims 5-8, 10-13, and 15-18 remain in this application.

Claims 5-8, 10-13, and 15-18 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) over Pinder et al. (US 6,105,134) in view of Schiffleger (US 5,434,970).

Amended claim 5 recites “a plurality of independently operated decoding units configured to decode the encoded data stored in said memory unit” in addition to the “plurality of independently operated processing units.” Moreover, amended claim 5 recites, “an operation command issuing unit configured to issue a command responding to the request for the operation to a corresponding one of the plurality of independently operated decoding units if the current time is judged by said judging unit to be in the time period authorizing use of the encoded data according to the verified applicable time data, whereby selectively enabling one of the plurality of independently operated decoding units and one of the plurality of independently operated processing units to execute the requested operation.”

Amended claim 6 recites “an operation command issuing unit configured to issue a command responding to the request for the operation to said decoding unit and a corresponding one of the plurality of independently operated processing units if the current time is judged by said judging unit to be in the time period authorizing use of the encoded data according to the verified applicable time data and said plain data storage unit does not store the decoded data, and to issue a command responding to the request for the operation to the corresponding one of the plurality of independently operated processing units if the current time is judged by said judging unit to be in the time period authorizing use of the encoded data and said plain data storage unit stores the decoded data, whereby selectively enabling one of the plurality of independently operated processing units to execute the requested operation.”

Pinder does not teach or suggest a plurality of independently operated decoding units as recited in claim 5. As shown in Figure 2B of Pinder, the decryptors 234, 236, and 238 are not independently operated. In fact the decryptor 236, which receives a multi-session key (MSK),

depends on an operation of the decryptor 234. The decryptor 238, which receives a control word (CW), depends on an operation of the decryptor 236.

The Office Action considers that an element (DHCTSE) 627 in Fig. 12 of Pinder is equivalent to the claimed operation command issuing unit. However, the "interface 1203" in  
× Fig. 12 of Pinder (which merely permits passage of data) is not equivalent to the plurality of  
× decoding units in the claim. There is no teaching or suggestion in Pinder that the element 627 issues a "command" responding to the request for the operation to a corresponding one of the decryptors 234, 236, 238 in Fig. 2B if the current time is judged to be in the time period authorizing use of the encoded data according to the verified applicable time data.

It is also alleged that Schiffleger discloses a "plurality of independently operated processing units (Fig. 1, element 202.1 to 202.N) and a plurality of decoding units (Fig. 2 Sub-Circuit 71; Col. 5, lines 1-27)."

Even if processor 1201 is replaced with the plurality of processors 202.1 to 202.N in Fig. 1 of Schiffleger, element 627 still does not provide the function of the operation command issuing unit. Moreover, Schiffleger fails to disclose "an operation command issuing unit" that issues a command responding to the request for the operation to a corresponding one of the sub-circuits 71.1 to 71.N if the current time is judged to be in the time period authorizing use of the encoded data according to the verified applicable time data.

Unlike the claimed invention, Pinder and Schiffleger cannot selectively enable one of the plurality of independently operated processing units to execute a requested operation, when the current time is judged to be in the time period authorizing use of the encoded data.

Neither Pinder nor Schiffleger, taken independently or together, teach an "operation command issuing unit," as recited in claims 5 and 7 or the related method step of claims 10 and 12 or the related storage medium having program code instructions of claims 15 and 17.

Neither Pinder nor Schiffleger, taken independently or together, teach an "operation command issuing unit," as recited in claims 6 and 8 or the related method step of claims 11 and 13 or the related storage medium having program code instructions of claims 16 and 18.

Withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

Appln. No.: 08/932,543  
Amendment dated June 23, 2003  
Reply to Office Action of April 1, 2003

**CONCLUSION**

It is believed that no fee is required for this submission. If any fees are required or if an overpayment is made, the Commissioner is authorized to debit or credit our Deposit Account No. 19-0733, accordingly.


All rejections having been addressed, applicant respectfully submits that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicits prompt notification of the same.

Respectfully submitted,

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated: June 23, 2003

By:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Susan A. Wolffe  
Registration No. 33,568

1001 G Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20001-4597  
Tel: (202) 824-3000  
Fax: (202) 824-3001  
SAW